

Date: Sat, 29 Oct 94 04:30:08 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #1170  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Sat, 29 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 1170

Today's Topics:

                    FT-530 vs. TH-79A?  
                    low power fm short range xmitter  
Subject: Keeping in touch by Ham radio: round the world  
                    Subject: W1AW steps on others?  
                    What is my CQ zone number

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 28 Oct 1994 16:48:35 GMT  
From: smitty@azol.com (Bruce Smith)  
Subject: FT-530 vs. TH-79A?

Hello everyone,

Lately Ive been thinking about getting the new TH-79A and selling my  
FT-530. It appears to be a very nice HT from what Ive read. I would like  
to hear any comments from TH-79A users on how they feel about that HT  
since they've owned it. The only complaint I would have with the FT-530  
would be the receive audio. Other than that I have really enjoyed it. Its  
nice to hear from users of a particular rig before spending the money and  
finding out certain pros and cons about it later. Please send any replys  
directly to me. Thank you very much...

73, Smitty / KB7QEY

smitty@azol.com

-----

Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 14:09:49 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: low power fm short range xmitter

In article <gradyCyD6zy.Jup@netcom.com> grady@netcom.com (Grady Ward) writes:  
>

>Part 15 was rewritten a few years ago to change the low power  
>definition to one of field strength rather than ERP. Rec.radio.pirate  
>has a lot of information about operating fm stations outside the  
>FCC rules.

Part 15 was rewritten to change the power definition to one \*of\* ERP,  
which is equivalent to field strength, rather than one of specifying  
a 100 mW \*input\* power limit and an antenna length restriction as was  
the case with the old rules.

Rec.radio.pirate does indeed discuss illegal operation counter to  
FCC rules. Even they don't normally countenance jamming, however.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 28 Oct 1994 13:01:21 GMT  
From: Charles.K.Scott@dartmouth.edu (Charles K. Scott)  
Subject: Subject: Keeping in touch by Ham radio: round the world

In article <2EB0A8EE@smtp>  
pve@dg13.cec.BE (VEKINIS Peter) writes:

> If he lands on a  
> country not under FCC jurisdiction, he then must have the permission of the  
> host country (exception: Canada it is automatic) or a reciprocal agreement  
> with that country. Since he is not going to land, this isnt necessary.

Sorry, I didn't mean to imply he would not be landing. This is not  
another Voyager like attempt, this is a high speed race around the  
world and many stops will be necessary. Actually that's why the need  
for weather reports, if he was not landing he could simply divert  
around the weather but since he will have to land to refuel and  
reprovision he will have to be making stops at Hawaii, Guam,  
Phillipines, Seychelles, East Africa, West Africa etc.

What I'm interested in at this point in the planning would be the difficulties in setting up a network of people who could report the weather at those various locations so that up to the minute weather information could be relayed to the pilot. This may be redundant in that he will have a strike finder (indicates direction and intensity of lightning strikes) and will be intercepting satellite weather transmissions which will overlay his moving map display but things, on attempts like this, have a habit of going wrong so having a certain amount of redundancy is considered prudent. Besides the weather information overlay doesn't give actual conditions it just shows cloud patterns and weather fronts. Real up to the minute weather observation and the ability to transmit this could be an important part of the success of the attempt.

But I gather from your post that transmission from the aircraft is possible which would allow him to be in direct contact with the next stop.

Thanks for this information.

Corky Scott

-----  
Date: 28 Oct 94 13:18:33 GMT  
From: hamilton@BIX.com (hamilton on BIX)  
Subject: Subject: W1AW steps on others?

scott@rcp.co.uk (Scott Earle) writes:

>In fact, you could say that it was not an amateur broadcast at all, since it  
>was a \*broadcast\* and not a two-way communication. And they were certainly  
>not operating in the \*spirit\* of amateur radio (stepping on an existing pileup,  
>and not checking that the frequency is not in use).

>Why, therefore, should they make the \*broadcast\* in the amateur bands at all?

The FCC regs do allow broadcasts for very specific purposes including code practice and bulletins. Don't have my FCC rules book handy (packed away in preparation for a move) but perhaps someone else can cite the paragraph that applies. You can be sure that W1AW operates within the rules.

Regards,

Doug Hamilton KD1UJ hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715 FAX 508-358-1113  
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117, USA

-----  
Date: Thu, 27 Oct 94 23:44:10 -0500  
From: Leland Van Koten <leevankoten@delphi.com>  
Subject: What is my CQ zone number

David Adams <dave@flowserver.stem.com> writes:

>Greetings! I'm not planning on actively participating in the CQ WW  
>contest, but I thought if I heard a CQ from a needed local whilst  
>tooling through the bands, I might pop in with the appropriate  
>exchange...However, the rules specify giving one's CQ Zone Number...  
>I don't know mine (I live in the south bay area in california) if  
>anyone could help, I'd appreciate it.

You're in CQ Zone 3 (as is the entire US west coast and British Columbia). You might even try an occasional CQ of your own. Although domestic contacts don't count for points, they do count for multipliers, so everybody needs at least one contact on each band they're operating, in each zone and country. I don't know about other people, but I hesitate to call a domestic station that sounds like they're real serious about the contest just to get the multiplier, since I might keep them from getting a contact they need for points (and a multiplier). Also, calling someone in your own country who is calling "CQ contest" like they're real serious about it tends to result in lectures about how it's a "DX-only" contest, which is ALMOST, but not quite, true.

Lee, KE3FB in Md.

-----  
Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 19:21:52 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<2EAB50FC@smtp> <DfsruAVPBh107h@rcp.co.uk>,  
<1994Oct28.151924.5430@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu  
Subject: Re: Subject: W1AW steps on others?

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>this, and neither does K1MAN. K1MAN does other things, such as threatening  
>people who transmit on "his" frequency during his broadcasts, which the

I've never heard his bcsts from my Hawaii QTH - who is he and what does he bcst?

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Fri, 28 Oct 1994 14:35:28 GMT  
From: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

References<phb.783093624@melpar> <1994Oct26.125110.6229@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<phb.783199163@melpar>  
Reply-To: gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)  
Subject: Re: CW Learning: Going slow. : (

In article <phb.783199163@melpar> phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock) writes:

> I talked to some former (i.e., retired) intercept operators here at work,  
>and they all said that the \*best\* operators could copy groups at 40 WPM.  
>Many could not, and since they all had demonstrated rapid typing ability,  
>the problem was thought to be in the brain's ability to interpret discrete  
>characters. By contrast, many could copy plain text at higher speeds,  
>and since they were trained operators who copied by typewriter "automatically"  
>I can only surmise that somehow their brains processed and interpreted  
>text differently somehow than coded groups. In fact, one of the operators  
>I talked to laughingly said that "trying to copy groups at 45 WPM was  
>like trying to copy a tone."

Well the retired intercept operator I knew (he's passed on now) could do 60 WPM, but I did say he was the best I'd ever met. I'd tend to agree that most operators probably run out of steam nearer to 40 WPM. The book on the OSS that I read said the native intercept operators were in the 40 WPM range.

>>The limitation is not an aural one. Typically it's a mechanical  
>>limitation in transcribing the information onto the paper. Most  
>>people can't handwrite clearly at speeds above about 30 WPM, and  
>>"copying behind" with crypto text is an extremely difficult test  
>>of short term memory. Use of a typewriter is key to achieving very  
>>high copy speeds.

>

> Again, I'm really referring to \*skilled\* operators who use  
>typewriters efficiently and copy subconsciously. Evidence suggests  
>that even these operators are limited in character-copying ability  
>but can copy plain text at faster speeds. I'm just trying to under-  
>stand what the mechanism is that allows this to happen, and the  
>only explanation I've ever read elsewhere is the "syllable/word/  
>phrase direct interpretation" one; that is, the brain goes  
>into a "higher-level" interpretive mode even though the operator  
>may be copying subconsciously, and that's the only way that plain

>text can be copied faster than coded groups.

I suspect that some researcher has looked into this, but I can't point to a paper on the subject. However, I would note that you say one of the intercept operators you talked to said trying to copy above 45 WPM would be like copying a pure tone. Now I don't think that can be true, since that would apply to plain text as well. The ear still has to be able to distinguish the code elements to allow any copy at all. A pure tone would convey no information.

It seems paradoxical that interposing an intermediate step, that of word interpretation, between hearing the code elements and writing them down, would ~~\*increase\*~~ an operator's correct copy speed. I would have been of the opinion that the reverse would be true. That's what my friend maintained. He said thinking about the message spoiled copy.

That would indicate to me that there may be two distinct ways of "copying" code. One is the faithful character by character method demanded of crypto copy, and the other would be writing down from memory interpreted translations of what was heard. The latter would only work if the text was in a language interpretable by the operator, IE plain text in a language that he spoke, and delivered in bursts short enough to be retained verbatim in short term memory.

It seems to me that the speed limit is still set by how fast you can put the information on paper, IE a mechanical limitation. The brain would only be serving as a short term buffer for the text until you could transcribe it. For continuous text copy, it seems to me that you would fall further and further behind until the buffer overflowed.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: 28 Oct 1994 12:34:09 GMT

From: bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon)

References<Cy8J1v.3wA@wang.com> <19940ct26.114636.5713@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>

Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLetins

In article <CyCEKB.7Hq@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

|>

|> >As to wasting resources, 99% of what we do as amateurs could be  
|> >considered wasting resources by that standard. We're certainly  
|> >not going to be able to save up spectrum for later use, once the  
|> >moment is gone, it's gone whether we send anything or not.

|>

|> True, perhaps, but my time is limited, and if I can't log onto the  
|> local BBS because cookie recipes are being uploaded/downloaded, then I  
|> see it as a waste of resources.

Yes, and if I can't log onto the local BBS because ARRL Bulletins or DX BS  
is being uploaded/downloaded, then I see it as a waste of time.

So what's your point??

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon		de-moc-ra-cy (di mok' ra see) n. Three wolves
bill@cs.uofs.edu		and a sheep voting on what's for dinner.
University of Scranton		
Scranton, Pennsylvania		#include <std disclaimer.h>

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #1170

\*\*\*\*\*